

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1717

and private, wherever and whenever it occurs."

The Law Enforcement Commission stated:

A majority of the members * * * believe that legislation should be enacted granting carefully circumscribed authority for electronic surveillance to law enforcement officers.

The President, in his message added:

The only exceptions would cover those instances where the security of the Nation itself is at stake * * * and then only under the strictest safeguards.

Gentlemen, I submit that the international crime cartels which direct, and profit by, the illegal importation of narcotics threaten the very foundations of our country. They provide the means by which the vile contagion of addiction can spread and flourish.

In a bill I sponsored earlier this week, directing Federal financial aid to States and localities to help them construct and operate special hospital facilities for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, I pointed out:

We have not been able to stop the flow of dope which comes into this country through seaports, airports and thousands of miles of border. It is well nigh impossible to seal off all means of narcotics entry, though we should certainly aid to our pitifully small forces arrayed against it.

With that purpose in mind, I have today sponsored a bill to appoint 100 additional customs port investigators, 50 additional criminal investigators in the Bureau of Customs, and 50 additional enforcement agents in the Bureau of Narcotics. This is a highly necessary first step in augmenting our forces against the international criminal cartels.

But I must point out that manpower without the most modern scientific aids is of little use against the rich and arrogant lords of the underworld who command the most sophisticated equipment. It is as unreasonable to prevent our anti-narcotics fighters from using modern electronic aids as it would be to prevent them from using radios, automobiles, and advanced laboratory equipment.

The President's Law Enforcement Commission called upon the Congress to "enact legislation dealing specifically with wiretapping." I am glad to be able to carry out that suggestion today by sponsoring a bill to permit wiretapping by an authorized Federal officer engaged in the investigation of illegal importation of narcotic drugs into the United States.

Both of my bills today carry out strong suggestions made by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse, in its final report in November 1963. That report cited the inadequate manpower available to the Bureau of Customs, and called for appointments of additional customs port investigators and criminal investigators. The report stated:

Additional investigative personnel, properly trained and properly equipped, would permit more frequent and more thorough searches. Tighter controls would result in more interceptions of narcotics and dangerous drugs and in greater quantities. While the smuggling of drugs can probably never

be wholly eradicated, tighter controls would be a substantial deterrent to smuggling.

The same report also stated firmly:

The Commission recommends the enactment of legislation authorizing the use of wiretapping by Federal law enforcement officials in limited circumstances and, under strict controls to detect and prevent the international smuggling of narcotics.

Conceding the fact that the right to privacy "is a sacred right," the Commission nevertheless pointed out that wiretapping should be used only "to meet the most serious threats to society."

The Commission believes that the illegal importation of narcotics into the United States is a threat of this magnitude.

In my bill, the right to tap is carefully circumscribed. It provides that wire communication may be intercepted to obtain evidence of a violation of section 2(c) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act only after an ex parte order has been issued by a Federal judge permitting such interception.

The head of any executive department of the Federal Government responsible for investigation of violations of section 2(c) of the Narcotics Act, must first secure authorization from the Attorney General or his designated deputies. Then he may apply to a Federal judge for an order to permit interception.

The application to the court must contain full details of the communication facilities involved, information of previous applications involving the same facilities or persons, and any additional testimony or documentary supporting evidence required by the judge.

If the judge decides that the specified offense has been, is being, or is about to be committed; that the wiretap will be useful and necessary to obtain information, and that other means are not readily available for the same purpose, he may grant the order.

Each order so granted must specifically describe the facilities involved, and the specific period of time during which interception is authorized. Authorization is limited to a maximum of 45 days, and extensions may be granted for periods of not more than 20 days.

The information gained from authorized wiretapping may not be used as evidence in a Federal court criminal proceeding unless each defendant has been furnished with a copy of the court order not less than 10 days before the trial. However, a judge may waive the 10-day period if he finds that it was not possible to furnish the defendant with the required information 10 days before trial, and that the defendant will not be prejudiced.

The bill also provides for constant control and surveillance by the Congress. It requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to make a full report to the Congress each March, listing the number of applications which were made, granted and denied during the preceding calendar year.

This bill is similar to one I offered before the first session of the 89th Congress, which was never enacted. At that time, I stressed the critical need to place such modern weapons at the disposal of the Federal forces of law and order to

strengthen our fight against the scourge of narcotics.

Each year that goes by sees the vice overlords reaping richer harvests of money from the misery of those they snare in their well-organized net of international narcotics distribution.

Gentlemen, the "bad guys" have armies of henchmen and untold resources working for them. Let us add what we can to the power of the "good guys." I urge you not to let another session go by without enacting this measure, and placing a little more weight in the right side of the scales of justice.

THE CIA-NSA AFFAIR—SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, when Michael Wood, formerly the Director of Development for the National Student Association contacted Ramparts magazine and divulged the financial relationship of NSA and the CIA, the leftwing nature of the student organization was given national attention once again. Presumably the purpose of the CIA funds was to further the interests of the United States and to support present Government positions on important issues such as the Vietnam war. According to the New York Times of February 19 Mr. Wood said of the Vietnam war:

I think it's bitterly brutal. It makes me ashamed of being associated with the present Government.

Of course, anyone who has followed the antics of NSA, especially in the 1960's is not surprised at the latest turn of events. To provide some idea of the support which NSA has given to Government policies on foreign policy issues, some of the resolutions passed by that organization in recent years are enlightening:

Condemned the involvement of the U.S. Government in the Cuban refugee invasion of their former homeland in April of 1961—R—XIV, 1961, pages 129-131.

Denounced the "extreme police brutality" of the Diem regime in South Vietnam and urged the United States government to "review its support of the Diem regime" without mentioning the atrocities committed upon the free people of South Vietnam by the Communist terrorists—e.g., the Vietcong—SR—XVI, 1963, page 157.

Censured the U.S. Government for utilizing military force to suppress the anti-American riots in the Panama Canal Zone in January of 1964—R—XVII, 1964, pages 161-162.

Asked the U.S. Government to propose the admission of Communist China to the United Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly—SR—XVIII, 1965, pages 152-153.

Recommended that the United States immediately cease the bombing of North Vietnam, suspend all offensive military action in South Vietnam, and extend its offer of "unconditional talks" to include separate National Liberation Front participation—SR—XVIII, 1965, pages 153-156.

Condemned U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic in the spring of 1965—SR—XVIII, 1965, pages 156-159.

R—Resolutions are statements of NSA policy on general issues passed by the annual NSA Congress and they remain in force until

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00149R000100170012-3

H1718

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

amended or repealed by a majority vote of the National Student Congress.

SR—Special Resolutions are items of NSA policy which apply to particular situations and they are in force until the next National Student Congress unless otherwise specified.

1960, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65—Indicates the year in which the resolution was adopted by the National Student Congress.

XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII—Indicates the Congress which passed the resolution.

NSC—Passed by the National Student Congress.

Mr. Speaker, how the CIA could continue to finance an organization with such a record is a question of great interest at the present time. The practice of influencing international student endeavors in opposition to Communist efforts to infiltrate the ranks of uncommitted students from many countries was certainly an advisable practice. A Senate Internal Security report issued in 1963 and entitled "The Communist International Youth and Student Apparatus" gives the background of Communist efforts to influence students on a worldwide basis:

At the end of 1946, the Communist Information Bureau or Cominform was created to control the activities of the Communist Parties. The year before, in London, the Communist youth organizations of the world joined with many non-Communist organizations to form the World Federation of Democratic Youth. Only a few years went by, however, before the non-Communist youth organizations realized that the WFDY was under complete Communist control and that there was no opportunity for expression of any point of view other than the Communist within its ranks. By 1948, almost all the non-Communist organizations had left and shortly after that the Communists were left isolated in the WFDY.

A second Communist international organization which was established in 1946 was the International Union of Students, a group which was affiliated with the WFDY. In 1947 both the CIA and NSA came into existence, but it was not until 1952 that CIA funds were first channeled to NSA to counteract Communist efforts in the international student area. During the intervening years those familiar with the CIA activities claim that the arrangement proved beneficial to the interests of the United States. However, the secret nature of the CIA and its structure as a Government agency make it difficult to explain why the arrangement was continued up to the present time. A review of the agency's structure and directorship indicate that not only the CIA itself was to blame.

The CIA was established under the National Security Act of 1947. Consisting of a Director and Deputy Director as its leadership and appointed by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the CIA is under the direction of the National Security Council, a body which was also established by the same National Security Act. The National Security Council is composed of the President, Vice President, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The functions of the agency are outlined as follows in the U.S. Government Organization Manual, 1966-67:

PURPOSE

For the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council:

1. Advises the National Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments and agencies as relate to national security.
2. Makes recommendations to the National Security Council for the coordination of such intelligence activities of the departments and agencies of the Government as relate to the national security.
3. Correlates and evaluates intelligence relating to the national security, and provides for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government using, where appropriate, existing agencies and facilities.
4. Performs, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies, such additional services of common concern as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally.
5. Performs such other functions and duties, related to intelligence affecting the national security as the National Security Council may from time to time direct.

As can be seen from the above listing, the phrase "national security" is a prime guideline for the agency activities. Also, it can be seen that the CIA is not an independent agency, but subject to the direction of the top leaders of the Government. Senator MILTON YOUNG, who is also on the Senate subcommittee which oversees the CIA, stated yesterday, according to newspaper accounts, that every investment the CIA made in an organization outside the Government was undertaken on written instructions, apparently from the National Security Council. He is reported to have said that CIA's checks were subject to scrutiny in the Bureau of the Budget, which, like the National Security Council, is a White House agency, and that in some instances CIA financial support originally was promoted by the State Department. It would be interesting to learn, within the limits of national security, how many of the ill-advised uses of CIA funds were originated and supported by the State Department.

While the establishment of overall policy is in the hands of those in charge of the CIA, it is claimed that the agency itself fumbled the ball concerning the use of basic intelligence procedures and precautions. Columnist Ted Lewis of the New York Daily News, in his column of February 21, contends that the CIA in the NSA case committed one of the most horrendous flops ever made by the spy establishment:

In the intelligence community a cover has to be a cover—has to be real, impenetrable and always safeguarded with periodic checks of those privileged to be privy to the secret operation . . . It (CIA) passed on the money through "foundations," each of which had employees without CIA clearance who knew where the government cash was coming from. And to top off that error in judgment, key officials of the NSA itself—young, starry-eyed idealists mostly—were told about how CIA financing was keeping the organization solvent—for a price.

Unfortunately, the damage caused by this affair extends to anti-Communist programs which now might suffer. The chairman of the Senate subcommittee

which oversees CIA operations, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, said that the dispute had greatly damaged the effectiveness of the CIA. He added that it now "might be well for the CIA to sever the financial connections with a great number of organizations." If the use of CIA funds for questionable purposes—newspaper accounts of recent days have pointed out a number of them—is reviewed and all future allocations made to stand the test of furthering the security and interests of the United States, then future efforts will benefit from this dispute. Surely, the elimination of NSA from the scene is a step in the right direction. However, any congressional probe into the operations of CIA should be conducted behind closed doors and by those who are knowledgeable on the operations of the CIA such as members of the Special Subcommittee on Central Intelligence Agency of the House Armed Services Committee.

As for NSA, it is hoped that the Internal Revenue Service's review of the tax-exempt status of the organization is a comprehensive one. Moreover, such a review would be useful as NSA, according to the New York Times of February 14, "hopes to finance its activities in the future by a 'consortium' of private and open Government funds."

In addition, future contributors to the NSA kitty should, in all fairness, be apprised of any possible past misuse of organizational funds as reported by the Washington Post staff writer Andrew J. Glass in the February 16 issue:

A source within the NSA hierarchy said CIA funds, funneled to his group through the Foundation, were sometimes diverted from international accounts and used for such domestic student activities as civil rights. Travel allowances for trips abroad were also juggled in order to finance NSA's domestic activities through the CIA's indirect contributions, the source said.

Most commonly, the NSA's source said, administrative funds that came from the CIA were diverted for domestic programs, it was explained.

As for future operations in the international student area, private financial efforts should have, by virtue of the NSA affair, learned that the guideline of national security must be a prerequisite for their funds. Organizations that are realistic about the danger of the international Communist threat and its danger to our national security should receive first consideration. For instance, the organization, Young Americans for Freedom, has prepared its members, by the use of realistic and responsible study materials and programs, to recognize and thwart Communist designs directed at our young citizens. Although YAF has at times taken positions in opposition to Government policies, in cases involving directly the national security of our Nation as in the cases of the American intervention in the Dominican Republic, the admission of Red China to the U.N., and especially the necessity of a firm defense of the Vietnamese people in South Vietnam, YAF policies are essentially in agreement with the U.S. Government. Surely, members of organizations such as YAF are to be recommended to combat Communist influence among uncommitted students around

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1719

the world than are those of NSA, an organization which has in recent years been parroting the Moscow line.

Another responsible organization which has prepared interested groups to cope with the international danger of communism is the Institute for American Strategy. A short history of accomplishments since its founding in 1958 should recommend it for serious consideration:

THE INSTITUTE FOR AMERICAN STRATEGY

The Institute for American Strategy was founded in 1958 by a number of representative national organizations and educational institutions as a national clearing house and service center to work with government and private agencies to further public understanding of:

1. The foundations of American strength and freedom.
2. The Communist challenge to American freedom and to freedom everywhere.
3. How a free society can meet the Communist challenge.

Its founding was the outgrowth of a series of seven annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conferences, starting in 1955, at which government, military, industrial, educational and other leaders met to clarify understanding of Communist aims and strategy and to develop countermeasure psycho-political activity, within the framework of American principles, to offset this Communist threat.

The Institute for American Strategy is a non-profit tax-exempt educational corporation. It was incorporated under the laws of Illinois on February 24, 1958 and maintains its headquarters at 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

Institute for American Strategy educational programs have included the preparation of text and reference books, pamphlets, and film strips conducting seminars for governmental and private groups. In its activities, the Institute has not sought to influence legislation in any area.

The Institute for American Strategy has sponsored and, with many national organizations, has co-sponsored Cold War seminars throughout the country. The Institute initiated and, with the Reserve Officers Association, sponsored the first National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers at the National War College in 1959 and sponsored the second seminar a year later. These seminars were so successful that the Department of Defense made them a part of its regular educational program.

The Institute served as consultant to Governor Farris Bryant, Chairman of the National Governors' Conference Committee on Cold War Education and as secretariat for the 1963 Conference on Cold War Education which brought together more than 70 top authorities for development of Cold War educational plans for the governors' consideration. The National Governors' Conference also selected the Institute to develop and conduct a seminar for gubernatorial aides in 1964.

Among publications of the Institute are "American Strategy for the Nuclear Age" of which more than 100,000 copies were sold and distributed, "Strategy Seminar Handbook", "Readings in the Protracted Conflict", "Teaching About Communism and Democracy: Case Studies", "Current Communist Non-Military Strategy", and "Strategy, Survival and the Private Citizen"—to name a few.

One widely-used Institute publication is "Education and Freedom in a World of Conflict". The members of the Editorial Board for this book were: Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, recently Detroit Superintendent of Schools and now Professor of Education at Yale University; Dr. William Y. Elliott, Professor-

Emeritus of Government at Harvard and now at American University, and Benjamin C. Willis, Chicago's recently retired General Superintendent of Schools.

These reference and guideline books are used widely by educators at the secondary school and college level.

As the consultant to the Joint Committee of the National Education Association and the American Legion, the Institute assisted in its publication, "Teaching About Communism-Guidelines for Junior and Senior High School Teachers".

It also has conducted extensive national surveys of the nature and extent of public school instruction about Communism's challenge to freedom.

In September, 1966, the Institute for American Strategy held dedication ceremonies for its newly founded Freedom Studies Center at Boston, Va. Approximately 2,000 people attended the ceremonies, with representatives and members of such Government agencies as the State Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff, the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives in attendance. Congratulatory messages were received from President Johnson, General Wheeler of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, and Speaker John McCormack of the House of Representatives. The basic purpose of the center is to train personnel on various aspects of the cold war and Communist strategies and tactics.

Here is a responsible undertaking which is worthy of the consideration of anyone interested in helping those in foreign lands maintain and preserve their freedom. The center will train people from the Americas in addition to the training of present and future leaders from countries elsewhere in the world. Special courses for those from the developing nations of Africa and Asia will be stressed because of the urgent need for helping peoples of those areas to remain free. An outline of the center's proposed courses follows:

OUTLINE OF COURSES

Studies at the Freedom Studies Center will cover a broad spectrum. Seminars and formal studies of graduate students when year-round courses begin will be tailored to the special needs and interests of a group, or of a student. The following outline indicates the broad range of subjects from which a seminar program, or a course of study can be selected:

A. Economics, Ideology, Philosophy, Political Theory:

1. The Role of Ideology in Conflict and Crisis: The basic assumptions of theories of democracy and totalitarianism and practices based on these assumptions. Marxist-Leninist theories of conflict. Articulating the freedoms of free societies in the battle of ideas.

2. The Competitive Society and the Managed Society: The competitive society is one in which the individual and the private sector provide the wellsprings of growth, progress, and direction as contrasted to the managed society in which the course of society is plotted by an elite group. The competitive society accommodates conformity. Analysis of the strength and weakness of both societies with special reference to the potential of the competitive society for the mobilization of its creative and liberative powers.

3. Economic Surveys: Economic balance sheets of the Soviet Bloc, Communist China, the uncommitted countries, and the free world. Economic problems of the developing countries.

B. Strategy, Tactics, and Techniques of Struggle:

1. Conflict Organization and Management: The development of non-traditional methods of struggle. Soviet and Chinese Communist non-military forces.

2. Western Options: Focal points in conflict. The development of strategies for rendering harmless the new forms of forcible, semi-forcible, and non-forcible conflict. Psycho-political elements of non-military strategy. Contributions of the private sector in information, research, training, and other areas to Western assets.

3. Evolution of Twentieth Century Conflict: The dimensions of new and continuing forms of struggle. Semantic and strategic problems created by the obfuscation of the traditional peace/war line. The moral and psycho-political impact of nuclear weapons and war psychoses. On-going patterns of conflict: Revolutionary warfare; unconventional warfare; proxy warfare; sanctuary warfare.

4. Tactics and Techniques: The role of intelligence and counter-intelligence in non-traditional forms of conflict. Propaganda identification, analysis, and techniques. Psycho-political warfare: Propaganda, demonstrations, marches, and organizational techniques in group mobilization; "professional" students and educational warfare; organized non-violence. Economic sanctions, economic pacific blockade, financial operations, trade offensives, and other techniques of economic competition or conflict. Tactics and techniques of insurgency and counter-insurgency.

C. Science and Technology and World Politics: Scientific and technological competition and the world balance of forces. Scientific and technological aid to the developing countries. Technological developments for conflict resolution.

D. Area Studies: The Center will not attempt to duplicate the excellent general area studies programs now being conducted by many colleges and universities. Rather the Center will focus attention on the problems and the problem-solving techniques of exploitable conflict situations in areas such as Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia.

Finally, in view of the fact that taxpayers' dollars have been paying NSA bills for the last 15 years, information concerning the structure, activities, and policies of this organization should be of value in appraising the worth of this body. The NSA report was prepared by Young Americans For Freedom, Inc., in 1966 and is current and comprehensive. It provides much food for thought, and for this reason I insert it in the Record at this point:

NSA: A REPORT ON THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION BY YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM, INC.

To adequately comprehend the significance of the organization known as the United States National Student Association within the context of the present political crises which confront the nations of the Free World, one need merely consider the enormous amount of influence wielded by student groups in other parts of the world. While the National Student Association may not influence popular opinion in this country to the extent that similar associations of university students do in nations like Japan and the developing nations of Asia and Africa, NSA does purport to be the recognized voice of the American intellectual community. Testifying before congressional committees, speaking on behalf of American college and university students at national and international youth conferences, and generally claiming to represent the views and aspirations of American youth, NSA deserves our

H1720

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

most serious consideration and study. That is the purpose of this booklet, and we hope that through it, those who find themselves faced with the almost monolithic Liberal bureaucracy which has characterized NSA since its inception will find some practical suggestions for counteracting the grossly disproportionate influence of NSA in American student affairs.

GENESIS OF NSA

In the summer of 1946, twenty-five American students boarded a ship in New York for a voyage to Prague, Czechoslovakia, where they attended the World Student Congress and participated in the formation of the International Union of Students (I.U.S.) along with delegates from thirty-eight other countries. According to the official *History of USNSA*, the American delegation "could see the profound need for a forum of American student leadership, a body through which international representation and information could be maintained," and, upon returning to the United States, constituted themselves as "the Committee for the Chicago Student Conference". Supported by nine (9) of the organizations which had originally organized the American delegation to Prague, the Committee sent invitations to student leaders throughout the United States to attend a meeting at the University of Chicago during Christmas vacation in order to discuss the formation of a national union of students in this country.¹

Students representing about 200 colleges and universities and a number of youth organizations answered the summons and attended the Chicago conference in December, 1946, which culminated in the election of a Continuations Committee which was assigned the task of drafting the organization's constitution and planning a constitutional convention.

NSA's Constitutional Convention was held at the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1947. In addition to adopting the Association's constitution, the more than 300 delegates approved a budget of \$26,000 and passed resolutions supporting the World Student Service Fund and United Nations Day. A proposition calling for "qualified affiliation" with the International Union of Students, which was recommended by the Continuations Committee, was defeated although the delegates decided to continue to investigate the possibilities of affiliation with the IUS.

In 1950, representatives of the National Student Association attended a meeting in Stockholm to discuss "new means of international cooperation." Delegates to the conference, including NSA representatives, agreed that no new international student organization should be formed and indicated that the meeting, which became known as the International Student Conference, "was not intended to be a Western international student organization to counter IUS."² However, the next conference, which was held in Edinburgh culminated in the formation of the Coordinating Secretariat of National Union of Students (COSEC). NSA joined the International Student Conference (ISC) in August of 1964 when the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted the ISC Charter.

MEMBERSHIP IN NSA

It should be understood from the outset that what we are speaking of when we refer to NSA membership is *student government membership*. There is no such thing as individual memberships in the National Student Association, and students on a given campus are "represented" by virtue of their schools' student government membership in NSA—even if they are not cognizant of NSA

or its activities. To sign-up member institutions, NSA rarely goes to the student body for approval, but, instead, seems to prefer to deal with a handful of student leaders.

According to Article II, Section A of the NSA Constitution, membership in the Association is open to any institution of higher learning which is recognized by the United States Office of Education or any institution of higher learning whose minimum course is two academic years or more and which teaches courses other than those which are primarily vocational in nature. This of course means that, with the exception of certain technical schools, any college, university, or junior college in the United States could affiliate with NSA.

Since it is technically the student government and not the school itself which may affiliate with NSA, schools with two or more student governments may send two or more delegations to the Association's annual congresses and, thus, be counted twice in votes on highly important and sometimes controversial issues. For example, Harvard College, Radcliffe College, and Harvard-Radcliffe Graduate School, and the men's and women's colleges of the University of Pennsylvania are all represented separately at the annual NSA Congress.

In May of 1961, the National Student Association claimed a total membership of 399 colleges and universities.³ Although actual membership in the Association has fluctuated considerably since the organization was born in August of 1947, NSA has experienced an increasing number of disaffiliations in recent years. The mass exodus of member schools prompted a lengthy debate at the Seventeenth National Student Congress concerning the Association's political entanglements which many student leaders believed were detrimental to the Association's ability to function as a service organization, but a resolution which sought to limit NSA's political activism was defeated and, by October of 1965, NSA's total membership had plummeted to just below the three-hundred mark. Many of the schools withdrew because of the relative ineffectiveness of the Association's programming services or because of NSA's political pronouncements, while only a few withdrew for financial reasons.

The following is a *partial* list of the colleges and universities which withdrew from the National Student Association between January of 1961 and January of 1966.

Colleges and universities which have withdrawn from N.S.A. 1961-65

Allegheny College (Pa.).
Amherst College (Mass.).
Antioch College.
Arkansas A&M.
Ball State College (Ind.).
University of Baltimore.
Bates College (Me.).
Beloit College (Wis.).
Bennington College.
University of Bridgeport.
California Western University.
Canisius College (N.Y.).
Catholic University of America.
Central College (Iowa).
University of Colorado.
Cornell University.
Cottery College (Mo.).
Dartmouth College.
University of Dayton.
Denison University.
DePauw University.
Duke University.
Earlham College.
Eastern Nazarene College (Mass.).
Elmhurst College (Ill.).

Gannon College (Pa.).
Hillyer College (Conn.).
Hofstra University.
Hollins College (Va.).
Illinois State University.
Indiana University.
Iowa State University.
Long Island University.
Lynchburg College (Va.).
University of Miami (Fla.).
Michigan State University.
University of Missouri.
Muskingum College.
North Carolina State University.
Northwestern University.
Ohio State University.
University of Oklahoma.
Otterbein College (Ohio).
Randolph-Macon's Woman's College.
University of Rhode Island.
Rosemont College (Pa.).
Shorter College (Pa.).
Siena College (Tenn.).
Stonehill College (Mass.).
University of Texas.
Trinity College (Conn.).
University of Washington.
Western Maryland College.
Vassar College.
Yale University.

(The list of withdrawals was compiled from copies of the official *NSA Codification of Policy* for the five year period, 1961-66, the *USNSA Report*, 1963, pg. 29; and from questionnaires which were mailed to member institutions.)

WHO DOES NSA REPRESENT?

One important point must be remembered by every student who attends a college or university which is affiliated with the National Student Association—NSA claims that it, and it alone, represents "a point of view which is the most representative that can be obtained by the democratic process".⁴ NSA "... does claim to be the most representative of any student group existing in the United States today and to represent the views and opinions of the majority of American student leaders who have been democratically elected by their fellow students."⁵ According to NSA literature, this "representation" is most direct at the annual National Student Congress of NSA which the Association refers to "as the most important student forum in the United States" despite the fact that less than fifty per cent of the NSA member institutions even bother to send delegates to the conclave and few of those "representatives" in attendance are, in fact democratically elected by their respective student bodies.

In addition, NSA "represents" American students nationally and internationally on numerous committees and groups including the American Council of Education, the U.S. Commission for UNESCO, the U.S. Youth Council, the American Association for the U.N., International Student Conference, the World University Service, and the National Scholarship Service. In these groups and others, NSA represents the ultra-liberal-left line to be the true opinion of American college and university students.

THE STRUCTURE OF NSA

NSA is geographically divided into twenty (20) regions each of which, with the exception of the State of New York, is composed of one or more states. New York State contains two separate NSA regions—the Metropolitan New York Region and the New York State Region which is composed of all the colleges outside the New York City area with the exception of Skidmore College in Saratoga Springs, New York, which was a member of the New England Region of NSA in 1965. The New England Region of NSA

¹ *A History of USNSA*, published by the U.S. National Student Association, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 2.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

³ *Toward A Better Understanding of USNSA*, by the National Staff of USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., May, 1961, pg. 1.

⁴ *USNSA Report*, Philadelphia, Pa., 1963, pg. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.*

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1721

(Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island) contained the largest number of member schools in 1966 with a total membership of 34 senior (four-year) colleges and universities out of 108 eligible institutions of higher learning in the same category.

Prior to the Sixteenth National Student Congress of NSA, the regional chairmen and vice-chairmen from the Association's 22 regions served as voting members of the highly controversial National Executive Committee (NEC). The NEC was responsible for the vast majority of the Association's legislation prior to 1963 and some hailed its dissolution, but it was quickly replaced with a new, smaller body known as the National Supervisory Board (NSB).

THE NATIONAL SUPERVISORY BOARD (NSB)

The National Supervisory Board of NSA came into existence at the Sixteenth National Student Congress which was held in Bloomington, Indiana, in the summer of 1963. The NSB replaces the highly controversial National Executive Committee (NEC) of NSA which had, during the course of its existence, been responsible for the enactment of a seemingly disproportionate share of the Association's legislation. It had been the practice to refer the resolutions which were not considered at the Plenary Session of the annual Congress to the NEC for action, but this power was not passed on to the NSB although the smaller National Supervisory Board does have the authority to enact certain interim or "emergency" policies for NSA when the need for such arises between meetings of the annual Congress.

The National Supervisory Board (NSB) consists of ten voting representatives who are elected from four great, consolidated regions at the annual NSA Congress plus the national officers. In addition to the "emergency" powers described above, the NSB has the authority to (1) enact the time and place of the annual Congress; (2) elect all of the National Advisors; (3) supervise the execution of the policies and programs as determined by the National Student Congress; (4) approve all appointments made by the President to fill vacancies on the Association's administrative staff; and (5) suspend or remove, by a two-thirds vote, the National Officers. All of these powers, which are enumerated in Article V, Section D, of the NSA Constitution, would certainly appear to indicate that the NSB's powers are, in fact, more extensive than those granted to the now defunct National Executive Committee. The power of the NSB was challenged in the spring of 1965 when the then NSA President, Stephen J. M. Robbins, issued a statement which strongly condemned United States intervention in the Dominican Republic. The statement, which was carried by the Collegiate Press Service (CPS), caused no small amount of controversy and, before the 18th National Student Congress began, Robbins apologized to the National Supervisory Board for not clearing the statement with them before making it public.⁸

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS

The policies and programs of NSA are, for the sake of administration, divided into two distinct major areas. These administrative divisions are referred to as "Commissions".

The National Affairs Commission of NSA, which operates under the supervision of the Association's National Affairs Vice-President (NAVP), is, ostensibly, concerned with those issues which have some relevance to the academic community which NSA purports to represent. The National Affairs Commission deals with such problems as academic freedom, student housing, human relations, citizenship, and political awareness and ac-

tion.⁹ Items included under the jurisdiction of the National Affairs Commission, however, do not always bear a direct relationship to the campus per se, but, instead, extend outward to the surrounding community to include participation and/or support of community social action programs (e.g., civil rights) and debate on issues affecting the national security (e.g., abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities). In 1964, for example, the National Student Association operated "a literacy project" with the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in Selma, Alabama.¹⁰

The International Affairs Commission of NSA is directed by the International Affairs Vice President (IAVP) and deals with the relations between American students and their foreign counterparts. One of the International Commission's projects is POLBACK; the Political Background Project of NSA. According to the POLBACK brochure, the purpose of the project is "to provide the American student with current information through sets of political background papers, to be used in seminars or in campus-wide programs . . . POLBACK provides information and analysis which cannot be found in textbooks. . . ." As of April 1, 1965, the NSA listed a total of only seven (7) POLBACK booklets which were then available including *The Rise of the Latin American Left, Panama, Angola and Mozambique, and South and Southwest Africa*. The POLBACK entitled *The Rise of the Latin American Left*, by Michael Schwartz, is a fifty page summation of leftist or communist activity in eight (8) Latin American nations which is, at best, rather speculative and, at least, a relatively mediocre library paper with a leftist-oriented bibliography.

Another project of NSA which comes under the jurisdiction of the International Commission was announced in a pamphlet entitled "Aid to Angola" which was distributed at the 18th National Student Congress (August, 1965). The pamphlet said, "The United States National Student Association (USNSA) and the National Union of Angolan Students (UNEA) appeal for your assistance in helping the Angolan people who, suffering under Portuguese colonialism, have fled Angola and are now refugees in surrounding African countries." The pamphlet goes on to say that " . . . the Angolan people were forced to organize to protect themselves and work for their interests. Following the formation of political parties, the revolutionary war began in 1961 and continues today under the leadership of the Angolan Revolutionary Government in Exile (GRAE), whose aim is to obtain national independence." According to the *Background Readings: African Student Affairs* which was prepared for the 18th National Student Congress by the International Commission, the President of the GRAE is Holden Roberto who also happens to be chairman of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FLNA) which, in turn, is a front group for the Communist terrorist group known as the Union of Angolan Peoples or Uniao das Populacoes de Angola (UPA) and the Parti Democratique d'Angola (PDA). In an article which appeared on page 48 of *African Student Affairs*, Paul Touba, the Secretary for Information of the UNEA said, "We in UNEA are dedicated to full participation in the revolution of our people in the interests of achieving national independence. To this end, we must continue to support the National Front for Angolan Liberation. In time of revolutionary war it is important to have a well organized governmental ma-

chinery. The Front is our machinery and we back it and support it. . . ."

THE NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS

Each summer, hundreds of delegates and alternates representing NSA member colleges and universities located throughout the United States travel to the campus of one of the largest midwestern universities in-order-to participate in the national legislative convention of the National Student Association known as the National Student Congress (NSC). NSA material states that the Congress has two principal functions: "It provides a meeting place for students from every area of the country to discuss mutual problems and ideas, and it is the official decision-making body for the policies and programs of USNSA." NSA claims that the NSC "remains the largest forum for the expression of the opinion and ideas of the American student community." One might begin to question the value of this "forum" and the representative nature of the annual Congress, however, when it is realized that (1) less than fifteen per cent (15%) of the junior colleges, colleges, universities, and graduate schools which are eligible for membership in NSA actually belong to the Association; (2) less than fifty per cent (50%) of the member institutions generally send representatives to the National Student Congress; and (3) most of the delegates and alternates which "represent" member schools at the annual Congresses are not democratically elected by the students whose views and aspirations they purport to represent. This, then, is the National Student Congress: a forum of student opinion representing the views of a few hundred young men and women who, in reality, can claim to represent no one but themselves, since most of them were not democratically elected by their fellow students. The few who are elected by their constituents usually will admit that they did not base their campaigns on the issues which are discussed at the National Student Congress.

In 1964, the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted an amendment to the NSA Constitution which ostensibly provided for the democratic election of delegates and alternates to the annual Congress. Article III, Section E (1) of the Constitution states that: "No more than two members in a delegation may be selected by means other than a democratic election by their entire student body as long as this procedure does not conflict with the constitution and by-laws of the member school." The loophole is, of course, contained in the latter part of the sentence and might be similar to a mythical Supreme Court ruling which stated that every American should be permitted to vote except in those states where law prohibits the exercise of such franchise to certain groups. In view of NSA's purported concern for the civil rights of the individual, it is ironic that the Association should indirectly abrogate the right of a university student democratically to choose who he wishes to represent his views at a national student forum, but, apparently, the Association is more concerned with maintaining its status as a vestige of the so-called "New Left" than its responsibility as a "representative" of the American student community. Determined to preserve the "liberal" status of the Association, many student governments altered their by-laws to prohibit the election of Congress representatives and, consequently, few of the delegates to the 1965 NSA Congress were elected by their respective student bodies.

The National Student Congress generally lasts about two weeks with the first week

⁸ *Codification of Policy, 1965-66*, by USNSA, Washington, D.C., pg. 7.

⁹ *The American Student*, by the International Commission of USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., 1965, pg. 14.

¹⁰ *The Congress News*, U.S. Student Press Association, August 23, 1965, pg. 4.

¹¹ *The Eighteenth National Student Congress*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., 1965, pg. 2.
¹² *Codification of Policy, 1965-66*, by USNSA, Washington, D.C., pg. 13.

H1722

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

usually devoted to committee and subcommittee sessions, regional caucuses, political caucuses, ad hoc study groups, workshops, and a number of special events (e.g., films, banquets, folkdancing) all of which vie for the attention of the delegates, alternates, and observers while the final week is generally dominated by the Congress Plenary Sessions which often last long into the night. While the summer Congress may represent two weeks of fun and frolic to some, the Congress and its pronouncements represent something far more serious for others. Writing of the 16th National Student Congress, William C. Wooldridge of Harvard College said: "... the Bloomington fiasco was the inevitable result of the Left's attempt to turn NSA into a sounding board for completely unrepresentative political opinions. Chief organ of the militant Left was the *Liberal Bulletin*, published by the Students for a Democratic Society. A typical Liberal effort, strong on emotional appeals (it had no headline with less than three exclamation marks), the *Bulletin* called the desire for 'more facts' indicative of a 'dangerous, self-defeating, and unbecoming mentality all to pervasive at this Congress.' Damn the uncertainties; full speed ahead!"¹¹ In a flash of insight, the October, 1965, issue of *Moderator* belatedly announced the emergence of the "New Left" as a dominant force in NSA. Following the 1965 NSA Congress, *Moderator* said: "Liberalism, or more properly the New Left, is in the ascendancy within USNSA. The organization took a turn toward a movement and away from being purely organizational at its Congress this summer."¹²

It is during the initial week of the Congress that delegates meet to discuss the issues upon which they must legislate during the final few days of the Congress. Armed with background papers which have been compiled by the NSA Staff, delegates begin their quest for truth by listening to the resource personnel which have been provided by the Association also. The background papers generally consist of a series of magazine reprints or excerpts from books. These materials reflect a liberal-left point-of-view and this mode of thought is usually complimented by the various speakers who appear. In 1965, for example, the background papers consisted primarily of reprints from magazines such as *The Student*, *The New Republic*, *The Commonwealth*, and *Africa Report* as well as some contributions from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Students for a Democratic Society. Referring to the February-March 1962 issue of *The Student*, a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate said that it "could almost have been an IUS publication."¹³ In 1965, the *Student* was one of the principal sources of background material which NSA supplied to the delegates to the 18th National Student Congress.

HOW IS NSA FINANCED?

According to a recent brochure issued by the National Student Association: "USNSA is financed by membership dues, grants from foundations for special projects, the sale of publications, and gifts from interested individuals and corporations." Some of the groups which have been identified as contributors by NSA include the Field Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs, and the New World Foundation. During the summer of 1964, for example, the National Student Association conducted a "literacy project" in Selma, Alabama in cooperation with the Stu-

dent Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) under the auspices of the Norman Family Fund and the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).¹⁴ In October of 1965, however, when NSA moved its headquarters to Washington, D.C., the Association refused to name the benefactor(s) who gave NSA a fifteen-year lease on a Washington home and \$20,000.00 with which to furnish it.¹⁵ According to the financial statements issued by NSA, the Association operates on a budget of less than \$100,000 per year, but reports filed with the Internal Revenue Service generally indicate that the Association's annual income from grants-in-aid, etc., is far in excess of this modest figure.

The National Student Association enjoys a tax exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the United States Internal Revenue Service Code of 1954. This section allows tax exemptions for "corporations . . . organized and operated exclusively for . . . educational purposes . . . no substantial part of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign . . ."¹⁶ The Code further provides that any organization which engages in prohibited activities will lose its tax exempt status and be taxed in full.¹⁷

The history of NSA's tax exempt status is rather interesting. NSA first applied for tax exemption as an educational organization in 1949. In a letter dated April 25, 1950, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue refused the requested exemption on the grounds that NSA did not qualify under the law. The ruling held that NSA was not operated exclusively for educational purposes and that "a substantial part of its activities consisted of attempts to influence legislation."¹⁸ To get around this, the 1954 NSA president, James M. Edwards again wrote to the Commissioner on March 26, 1954. Edwards pleaded that "students" had prepared the previous request for exemption "without the assistance of counsel" and that they "were not familiar with the Internal Revenue Service procedure on such rulings."¹⁹ Once again, he requested exemption, but this time he submitted a carefully selected stack of NSA publications all of which emphasized NSA's educational activities and ignored the political activities which the previous Commissioner had found as legal ground to refuse exemption. Bending over backwards to make his point, Edwards told the Commissioner:

"As a practical matter the resolutions (which concern legislation and are adopted by the NSA annual Congress) have not been implemented by any substantial activity on the part of the Association or its officers. Although in the summer of 1953, the Congress, without the advice of counsel, concluded that the Association should register as a lobbying organization, in the fall of 1953 the Staff considered this question, concluded that they and the Association did not engage in lobbying. . . ."²⁰

Edwards then included, in his rather lengthy letter, a resolution which was apparently passed especially for the benefit of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The resolution, dated March 4, 1954, said:

"Literacy: Project in Selma," *The American Student*, (Summer, 1965), pg. 14.

¹⁵ Nancy Moran, "Student Unit Moves Into a Rent-Free, Plush Office Here," *The Washington Post*, October 10, 1965, pg. B-4.

¹⁶ *Internal Revenue Code*, 501 et seq., Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962 ed.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 503(a)(1)(A).

¹⁸ Letter of March 26, 1954 from USNSA President James M. Edwards to the U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, pg. 2.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pg. 2.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pg. 16.

"Resolved, the United States National Student Association was organized exclusively for the educational purposes stated in the preamble of its constitution and no substantial part of its activities may constitute influencing or attempting to influence legislation by propaganda, lobbying or other means. The President and Vice Presidents of the Association shall have the duty of enforcing this resolution."²¹

Apparently, Edwards' letter, which was part of the sworn statement submitted by the National Student Association under penalty for perjury, was sufficiently convincing and, within a few months, the tax exemption was granted. The benefits of such a status become increasingly evident when one realizes that one of the principal sources of NSA funds is the tax exempt foundation which could not legally contribute to the Association if NSA, itself, did not continue to maintain its tax-free status.

Despite the legal restrictions regarding political activity noted above, a significant percentage of NSA's resolutions and program mandates do call for direct legislative action in a wide variety of areas. Whether or not this political involvement is in fact "substantial" depends upon your own definition of the term. Although the annual NSA Congress generally adopts more legislation concerning the academic community per se, most of the debate, and probably most of the thought, of the delegates to the National Student Congress are directed into other channels (e.g., political activism). At the 1965 Congress, for example, the major issue was the war in Viet Nam and, aside from that, nearly everything else played a secondary role. The 1962-63 *Codification of Policy* contained a resolution which commended and expressed support for demonstrations (e.g., picketing and sit-ins) designed to win legislative support for the recognition of labor unions in New York State hospitals and, more recently, in a resolution adopted at the 17th National Student Congress entitled "Public School Devotional Exercises," NSA urged the defeat of the Becker Amendment and other laws introduced in the United States Congress concerning the modification of the Supreme Court rulings regarding school prayer. The resolution also directed the Associations' National Staff to send copies of the aforementioned resolution "to the Hon. Emanuel Celler, Chairman, and to the Members of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives . . ."²²

These activities constitute a flagrant violation of the Internal Revenue Code and it would be entirely just and proper for the Internal Revenue Service to revoke NSA's tax exempt status as has been the fate of other groups and organizations who violated their sworn statements concerning the true nature of their activities.

POLITICS AND THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT

The eleventh article of the NSA Constitution is entitled "Participation in Political Affairs" and is ostensibly designed to restrict the Association's activities to issues relevant to the academic community. This section is divided into three distinct parts which state:

A. No body acting on behalf of USNSA shall participate in sectarian religious activities or partisan political activities; they shall not take part in activity which does not affect students in their role as students.

B. No substantial part of the activities of the national and regional bodies of USNSA shall be devoted to carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

C. The Congress, or between sessions of the Congress, the National Supervisory Board, may declare the action any body other than the Congress acting on behalf of USNSA to

²¹ *Ibid.*, pg. 17.

²² *Codification of Policy, 1965-66*, by USNSA, Washington, D.C., pp. 73-74.

¹¹ William C. Wooldridge, "Fiasco at Bloomington," *National Review* (October 8, 1963), pg. 303.

¹² "Special Report: The National Student Congress," *Moderator* (October, 1965), pg. 20.

¹³ *The Communist International Youth and Student Apparatus*, Washington, D.C., 1963, pg. 9.

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1723

have violated sections A or B above and prohibit and disassociate USNSA from such action.²³

The definition of "the student as student" clause has been the subject of much debate recently, but, according to NSA, its limits of concern are infinite. The Preamble to the NSA Constitution states that: "We, the members of the national union of students of the United States . . ." desire " . . . to maintain academic freedom, academic responsibility and student rights; . . . to promote international understanding and fellowship; . . . to guarantee to all people . . . equal rights and possibilities for primary, secondary and higher education regardless of sex, race, religion, political belief or economic circumstance. . . ." These lofty goals are the basis, or excuse, for NSA's political involvement. They are utilized to justify resolutions of a purely partisan political nature, i.e., the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for allegedly abridging the academic freedom of students; the admission of Communist China to the United Nations to further international understanding; and the condemnation of the Diem regime in South Viet Nam for "the brutal suppression of Vietnamese students and religious leaders."

In practice, "the student as student" limitation has become a license for involving NSA in anything and everything in current national and international politics.

THE MYTH OF "WORLD STUDENT UNITY"

Many of the NSA officers and supporters are unquestionably sincere in their attitude as to what really concerns "students in their role as students." In almost every piece of NSA literature one can generally find a seemingly inordinate attachment to what is euphemistically known as "world student unity." Policy resolutions continually emphasize a "solidarity" with students in underdeveloped, oppressed, or newly-emerging nations. It is significant, as noted earlier, that the National Student Association was founded by a group of American students who had attended the World Student Congress in Prague, Czechoslovakia, in the summer of 1946. The Introduction to NSA's *Codification of Policy* attempts to define the limits of student concern and the relationship between the American student and his foreign counterparts when it states:

"Students in institutions of higher education have a legitimate concern with all issues which affect them in their role as students. This is one of the basic premises of the United States National Student Association. No matter where these issues arise, whether in this country or abroad, all students everywhere are affected for they belong to a 'single commonwealth of the mind.'"²⁴

This paragraph is the basis for NSA's international involvement and, along with the Basic Policy Declaration on "International Student Cooperation" which was adopted by the 17th National Student Congress, it is also the basis for programs of assistance to the foreign student groups (e.g., the Union of Angolan Students—UNEA). NSA resolutions have pointed to such things as the overthrow of President Diem in Viet Nam, the overthrow of Batista by Castro, and the Japanese student riots against the impending visit of President Eisenhower as examples of "what students can do." Domestically, the NSA exults over the student involvement in the Southern sit-ins and the anti-HCUA riots which occurred in San Francisco in May of 1960. Following the anti-Draft and Viet Nam protests that the radical Left conducted in October of 1965, the NSA rushed to the defense of groups

such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Appearing at a press conference with SDS National Secretary Paul Booth, the 1965-66 President of NSA, Philip Sherburne, protested Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach's criticism of the anti-war demonstrations. Sherburne warned that such criticism might "serve to silence those who disagree with United States action in Viet Nam" and argued that the rights of all are threatened when the rights of a few (e.g., SDS) are abridged and the " . . . group is subjected to official harassment for its beliefs."²⁵

Contrary to the pious pronouncements of "solidarity" with students in remote parts of the world, however, the fundamental concept of "world student unity" is pure fantasy. Most students are involved in the educational process of higher learning for about four years—six or eight at the most. Being a college student is not a profession nor is it a way of life; it is a transitional phase in which the child becomes an adult, and concentrates on learning—not on total involvement in the weighty issues of national and international politics.

NSA, however, seems to aim at the "professional student" as its base of support. Thus, speaking of its own "place in American society" NSA says: "Each year . . . increases the necessity for its (NSA's) existence. For as the world becomes more complex and the four year college experience becomes more inadequate as a preparation for life and democracy, its potential as an organization becomes more vast."²⁶

Secondly, students in different countries live in vastly different political atmospheres. In many parts of the world, students are politically important because there is no significant middle class, little industrialization, and a severe lack of professional and intellectual leadership. This is obviously not the case in the United States. The sit-in movement and the Leftist campaign against the House Committee on Un-American Activities are not entirely student-led and the effect of student involvement in both of these movements on public opinion has been minimal.

Thirdly, the various student activities in foreign countries have little in common with the activities of American college students except for the involvement of students *per se*. In many countries, these activities have a strictly ideological basis and often result in blood-shed and violence.

THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENT CONFERENCE

As previously mentioned, the National Student Association sent representatives to the initial meeting of the International Student Conference (ISC) which was held in Stockholm in 1950, but NSA did not officially affiliate with the ISC until 1964 when the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted the ISC Charter. The NSA resolution stated that the "Seventeenth National Student Congress . . . Declares its commitment to the ISC as a framework for cooperation among national unions of students and affirms its full support for the Charter and the principles enunciated within it."²⁷ Excerpts from the ISC Charter were printed in the *Student*, the official magazine of the ISC, and the Charter states ISC's belief in a "Free University in a Free Society" which is " . . . fully sustained by the society of which it is a part . . ." and fulfills " . . . its vital role as a forum for the unfettered inter-play of ideas. . . . and as a center where even the most basic assumptions and institutions of society can be placed

in doubt, without fear of reprisals by any political, economic, or social force". ISC states that "Economic justice shall be achieved only when equality of economic opportunity, adequate material standards of living and the equitable distribution of national wealth depend on precepts and methods of economic planning and growth based on popular needs and aspirations rather than the rigid adherence to any particular economic doctrine."²⁸

The International Student Conference is supposedly the "non-Communist" alternative to the Communist-dominated International Union of Students (IUS), but in July, 1964, the delegates to the Eleventh International Student Conference held in Christchurch, New Zealand, adopted a resolution entitled "Universal Student Cooperation" which directed the Secretariat of the ISC (formerly COSEC) to enter into negotiations with the Secretariat of the IUS in order to achieve " . . . agreement on a set of common principles of cooperation between the two international organizations . . . the implementation of these principles of cooperation through initiatives supported by both international organizations . . . the expansion of bilateral, multilateral and regional cooperation between the members of the ISC and the members of the IUS. . . ." ²⁹ At the same Conference, the ISC delegates adopted a resolution on Panama which indicated that: "The ISC deplored the illegal activities of the United States secondary school students in the Canal Zone for not obeying the Flag Convention of June, 1963, and for instigating the riots of January, 1964, condemned the system of racial and nationality discrimination that exists in the Canal Zone, and urged the Governments of Panama and the United States to continue to negotiate in order to abrogate the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty and allow the Panamanian people to determine the conditions under which the Canal ought to operate."³⁰

On April 28, 1965, President Johnson dispatched American military forces to the Dominican Republic in order to protect the lives of more than 1,300 United States citizens and prevent the establishment of another Communist government in Latin America. The Dominican Republic was in a state of chaos as the result of a Communist-instigated revolution and the Dominican Government indicated that it could not guarantee the safety of U.S. citizens.³¹ Despite these facts, the Secretariat of the International Student Conference issued a statement condemning United States intervention in the Dominican situation. The statement was carried in a Collegiate Press Service (CPS) release and said:

"The Secretariat of the International Student Conference has watched with great concern the events in the Dominican Republic particularly in light of the deep interest students have shown in the progress which the Dominican Republic made toward the establishment of a democratic government with the election of Mr. Juan Bosch as President in 1962. . . . The ISC has consistently protested against outside unilateral interference in the affairs of any sovereign nation. . . . The Secretariat of the ISC demands the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Dominican Republic and an end to the unilateral intervention of the U.S. Government in the affairs of the Dominican Republic."

²³ *International Student Affairs*, International Commission on USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., 1965, pg. 32.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pg. 94.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pg. 36.

²⁶ "War Stops Up—Where It's Headed," *U.S. News & World Report* (May 10, 1965), pp. 31-33.

²⁷ "War Protestors Urge Jobs for Draft Foes," *The Washington, D.C. Evening Star* (October 20, 1965), pg. A-3.

²⁸ *USNSA Report*, 1963, op. cit. pg. 7.

²⁹ *Codification of Policy, 1964-65*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 141.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pg. 16.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pg. 7.

H1724

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

The same Collegiate Press Service release carried a statement by the National Student Association which said: "United States National Student Association (USNSA) strongly condemns the unilateral military intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic." The ISC statement was released in Leiden, Netherlands, on May 7, 1965, and apparently in the spirit of "world student unity," the NSA statement was issued in Philadelphia on the following day. NSA's condemnation became official in August, 1965, when the delegates to the 18th National Student Congress adopted a special resolution on the Dominican Republic which stated that "USNSA condemns U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic" and, thus, reaffirmed their belief in the concept of a "single commonwealth of mind" which is ostensibly the basis for the international student movement. After all, NSA would probably consider it chauvinistic to defend American foreign policy regardless of its motivation (e.g., humanitarian) unless such policy was in agreement with the policies of the ISC (e.g., military intervention in the Union of South Africa).

NSA AND THE RADICAL LEFT

One of the principal reasons why so many people are concerned about the National Student Association and its influence in American student affairs is because of its relatively extensive political involvement and, more especially, its relationship to the extreme left-wing of American politics. Indeed, this is one of the primary reasons why many students oppose participation in NSA while others seem to delight in its existence and the controversy which many of the Association's policies tends to precipitate.

Almost since its inception the domestic Left has recognized the value of NSA as a vehicle for its propaganda and a seemingly innocuous student lobby through which to push its socialistic legislation. The Left is generally well represented at the annual congresses and has generally succeeded in influencing the tenor of much of the Association's politically-oriented policies and programs.

At the 15th National Student Congress, which was held at Ohio State University in August of 1962, the Communist Party U.S.A. and other Leftist organizations were represented by some of their most articulate spokesmen including:

1. Daniel Rubin, the National Youth Director of the Communist Party and editor of *Communist Viewpoint* a monthly publication of the Communist Party U.S.A., specifically designed for youth.
2. Philip Luce, an official of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee a Communist-sympathizing organization which has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.
3. Burton White, an official of the Bay Area Committee for the Abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee and a key figure in the Communist-instigated riots against the Committee which occurred in San Francisco in May, 1960.
4. Marvin Markman, the Executive Vice President of Advance, the New York City Communist youth group which was ordered to register as a communist front organization, and, also, Vice Chairman of the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, a national communist youth front.
5. Susan Markman, the Youth Secretary of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, another Communist-sympathizing organization.

Much of the Association's legislation and programming has evoked considerable praise from some of the Left's leading journals including *Communist Viewpoint* and *The Worker*. For example, *The Worker* gave front-page headlines to NSA's Viet Nam resolution, which recommended a cessation in the bombings of North Viet Nam and all

offensive military operations in the South and separate negotiation with the National Liberation Front which was adopted by the delegates to the 1965 NSA Congress. The following editorial under the title "Young Voices for Peace" appeared in *The Worker* on September 12, 1965:

"The National Student Association which recently concluded a two week convention in Madison, Wis., has made a contribution to the struggle to end U.S. aggression in Vietnam on the basis of self-determination, by its overwhelming support to a resolution setting forth some pre-conditions which the U.S. Government must accept in order to bring about serious and meaningful negotiations.

This body, representing students from all over the country, called for the U.S. to cease immediately all bombings and all other offensive military action. They called on the U.S. Government to specifically include the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam in its offer to negotiate.

These proposals, which are in line with the stand of such major peace organizations as Sane Nuclear Policy and Women Strike for Peace, place the responsibility for the war on the Johnson Administration, and in fact expose the talk of readiness for unconditional negotiations as nothing but a coverup for continued aggression and the escalation of the war to where it perils Southeast Asia and the entire world.

It is in this light that we must also review the proposals made public by Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, which it was officially announced were cleared with the White House. . . .

But the real test of willingness to negotiate is to be found in the willingness to accept such proposals as that of the National Student Association, to end the bombings and all other offensive actions, and to negotiate with the representatives of the fighting people of South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front. . . ."

Communist Party functionaries (e.g., Daniel Rubin) have frequently participated in the annual congresses of the Association, but recently a more subtle, albeit more active, group of young radicals have managed to affect the mode of NSA policy. Operating under the guise of a "Liberal Study Group" and through the so-called Liberal Caucus, the organizations of the New Left (e.g., Students for a Democratic Society) have maintained the liberal-left persuasion of the Association. The defeat of a resolution at the 1964 NSA Congress which sought to limit NSA's political involvement to matters relevant to the academic community had a decided influence on the politically-oriented resolutions which were adopted at the 1965 conclave. The principal issue at the 18th National Student Congress was the war in Viet Nam, but the delegates also adopted resolutions which: (1) asked the United States Government to propose the admission of Communist China to the United Nations; (2) condemned United States intervention in the Dominican Republic; (3) endorsed rent strikes and school boycotts; and (4) recommended Government assistance for indigent anti-poverty groups, e.g., the SDS-operated JOIN project in Chicago. These are but a few of radical policies which NSA endorsed in August of 1965, but they are indicative of the Association's policies as a whole. Some might assert that the policies which were adopted at the 18th National Student Congress were more inordinate than the politically-oriented resolutions which were adopted at previous congresses, but the ideological content of the propositions is not significantly different than the content of prior legislation. The Association's policies have always demonstrated an affinity for the

programs of the domestic Left (e.g., the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities), but recently one might conclude that partiality has become an obsession.

As previously mentioned, NSA operated a "literacy project" in cooperation with the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) during the summer of 1964 and, in October of 1965, when the radical Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) became involved in a bitter debate with members of the Johnson Administration over its (SDS's) participation in the anti-draft and Viet Nam protests, the NSA President Philip Sherburne rushed to the defense of the Leftist group. Both of these organizations, the Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, are at the heart of the "New Left Movement" and their zeal for immoderation and their ideological commitment has been praised by such elite Leftists as Communist Party General Secretary Gus Hall who said: "Fronts are a thing of the past. We don't need them. We've got the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, and Student for a Democratic Society going for us, but they're not, 'fronts' in the usual sense of the word. They're just a part of the 'responsible left'—that portion of American youth that realizes society is sick."³³

The National Student Association has frequently pointed to the community action projects of organizations such as the Students for a Democratic Society as examples of student involvement and in 1965 urged Federal Assistance for the SDS-operated JOIN (Jobs or Income Now) project in Chicago. JOIN is, according to SDS, a predominantly white Uptown (Chicago) movement which has initiated rent strikes in the City's tenements.³⁴ Like most SDS projects, JOIN has a political education program which some might refer to as an indoctrination course since the SDS's cadre generally spend much of their time telling the poor how corrupt and undemocratic American society is.

In 1961 the delegates to the 14th National Student Congress of NSA adopted a resolution declaring NSA's approval of the objectives and programs of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee.³⁵ More recently the delegates to the 17th Congress approved a resolution entitled "Civil Rights Programming" which directed NSA's National Affairs Vice President to institute "a program of aid in the form of office supplies, food, clothing and fund raising" on behalf of SNCC, the Northern Student Movement (NSM), and the SNCC-spawned Council of Federated Organizations (COFO). SNCC's membership in the New Left and its involvement in the Viet Nam protests as well as demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA) have not affected NSA's relationship with the organization even though SNCC has been criticized by the more responsible civil rights organizations, e.g., NAACP. In January of 1966, for example, SNCC issued a policy statement concerning United States involvement in Viet Nam which was, according to SNCC Chairman John Lewis, approved by the entire national staff of SNCC without dissent. The SNCC statement urged draft-age Americans to avoid military service in Viet Nam by becoming involved in the "civil rights movement" and said:

We maintain that our country's cry of "preserve freedom in the world" is a hypo-

³³ Senate Internal Security Committee, *The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement*, October 13, 1965, pg. 16.

³⁴ "A Movement of Many Voices," Students for a Democratic Society, ERAF, Ann Arbor, Michigan, pg. 12.

³⁵ *Codification of Policy*, 1963-64, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 102.

³² "Young Voices for Peace," *The Worker*, September 12, 1965, pg. 3.

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1725

critical mask behind which it squashes liberation movements which are not bound, and refuse to be bound, by the expediences of the United States cold war policies.³⁰

The SNCC statement brought quick reaction from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in the form of a statement by the executive director of the NAACP, Roy Wilkins. Wilkins said that the NAACP "disassociates itself" from the SNCC policy statement and warned that SNCC's Viet Nam statement should not be considered as the policy of the "civil rights groups". Gloucester Current, NAACP program director, criticized the SNCC statement and accused SNCC leaders of neglecting civil rights work and turning their interest to participation in peace parades.³¹

These organizations, and others of their kind, have exerted an increasing amount of influence in their efforts to dictate NSA policy. Year after year, with almost phenomenal consistency, the delegates to the Association's summer congresses have enthusiastically endorsed the policies and programs of the domestic Left. The congresses have pledged assistance to the Left and have praised their "community action programs" while condemning those agencies and laws which seek to preserve the national security. NSA's resolutions on international affairs generally coincide with the type of foreign policy advocated by the Left, e.g., the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

NSA AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The National Student Association has frequently stated its opposition to those laws and governmental agencies which, NSA asserts, restrict the free exchange of ideas. The basis for this mode of thought is defined in a Basic Policy Declaration (BPD) entitled "National Security and Civil Liberties" which states:

"USNSA believes that it is the obligation of any government committed to democratic principles to guarantee full due process to every citizen.

"In their efforts to identify and punish 'subversive' elements within the population, American governmental agencies have sometimes engaged in practices unworthy of a free democracy. USNSA believes that the governmental practices which automatically and indelibly brand as 'subversive' members of many dissenting organizations or those who have refused on Constitutional grounds to testify before a Congressional Committee, which deny American citizens freedom to travel abroad solely because of their political associations or beliefs, which restrict to certain countries the right of free travel, which disenfranchise or extradite naturalized citizens for their political associations and beliefs, which authorize the deportation of purportedly 'subversive' aliens without judicial hearing, and which dictates to unions standards of political association and belief, are not consonant with standards of freedom and dignity embodied within the U.S. Constitution.

"USNSA repudiates the policy of denying federal education loans and grants to those with present or past membership in certain controversial organizations. USNSA further believes that loyalty oaths, political test oaths, or disclaimers as prerequisites for employment or as a basis for continued employment are procedurally ineffective and do not necessarily guarantee loyalty. USNSA believes that past associations with persons or organizations should not be considered in determining an individual's loyalty."³²

³⁰ "Rights Group Says U.S. Is Aggressor," *New York Times*, January 7, 1966, pg. 3.

³¹ "NAACP Denies Anti-Policy Move," Associated Press, New York, January 10, 1966.

³² *Codification of Policy, 1963-65*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pp. 43-44.

URGES ABOLITION OF HCUA

At the 14th National Student Congress held in Madison, Wisconsin in August, 1961, the major debate centered around the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a favorite target of the extreme Left. The debate did not occur because students throughout the United States were concerned about the Committee. The Communist-spawned "National Committee to Abolish HUAC" had been conducting a national campaign, particularly on college campuses, against the Committee. (This Communist group later praised the NSA for its opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities and widely publicized the NSA's stand on the Committee).³³

The NSA debate at Madison occurred because certain individuals and organizations had prepared the way for a major debate on the Committee. When NSA delegates arrived, they found the campus saturated with well-written and expensively printed literature advocating the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA). The outcome of the debate was not difficult to predict. One NSA delegate wrote the following comment in the *Queens College (N.Y.) Phoenix*:

"The HCUA hassle was the great test of the 'conservative challenge' and it was no test at all. Those who didn't want abolition wanted revision; those who didn't want to do away with the witch-hunters still were able to list all the evils of such a body. There was one use of the 'atheistic Communism' argument, but the audience laughed."³⁴

The Association formalized its opposition to the Committee in 1962 when the delegates to the 15th National Student Congress adopted a resolution urging the abolition of the HCUA (see Appendix). Continuing its opposition to the Committee, the 16th National Student Congress criticized the film "Operation Abolition" which documents Communist involvement in the anti-HCUA riots conducted in San Francisco in May, 1960. The NSA statement asserted that the charges made against the anti-HCUA rioters were unwarranted and expressed belief in the sincerity and "good intentions" of the students involved in the demonstrations.³⁵

THE MCCARRAN ACT

At the 15th National Student Congress held at Ohio State University in the summer of 1962, the question of gravest concern to the Communists and their sympathizers was the McCarran Act (Internal Security Act of 1950). Once again, the propaganda flowed. This time, the materials were supplied from the display booths of the Communist Party, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties. These subversive groups were permitted to set up display tables in the Ohio State Union Building. The Congress did not specifically call for the repeal of the McCarran Act, but the delegates did express "grave reservations" about the law and urged the U.S. Congress "to reconsider the McCarran Act." The Communists were elated about NSA's willingness to consider their views on a piece of legislation designed to restrict the activities of those groups dedicated to the overthrow of the United States Government. Commenting on the NSA Congress, Daniel Rubin wrote in *Communist Viewpoint*: "The Congress was notable for an expansion of areas of concern, a continued

³³ *Abolition News*, published by the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, January, 1963.

³⁴ Article by Peter Wolf and Nanette Rainone; edition of October 3, 1961.

³⁵ *Codification of Policy, 1963-64*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pp. 126-127.

dynamic, liberal trend on domestic issues and the first crack in Cold War policies; and for the first time in NSA history an (admitted) Communist spokesman was present."

NSA's opposition to Federal legislation designed to restrict the activities of subversive organizations and individuals is not an innovation in Association policy. The 1953 NSA Congress passed a resolution introduced by NSA President James Edwards which read in part as follows:

"Fact: The Fifth National Student Congress urged the removal of those sections of the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 which prohibited from entry into this country those persons who at any time have lent their support to a totalitarian government, who have held membership in such an organization, or who have subscribed to the economic or political doctrines upon which such a state or such an organization is based.

Declaration: The Congress believes that concrete steps must be taken to achieve such revision of the Act.

Action: NSA directs . . . this brief should be forwarded to our lobbying representative in Washington for appropriate action and also distributed to member schools as the basis for initiating a program of legislative pressure."³⁶

CASE STUDY: NSA'S DOUBLE STANDARD

A comparison of two resolutions adopted by NSA, one dealing with the Dominican Republic and the other dealing with the Union of South Africa, clearly demonstrate the difference between NSA's attitude regarding a nation which is subjected to Communist-inspired revolution and a non-Communist nation. In the summer of 1965, the delegates to the Eighteenth National Student Congress condemned the United States for intervening in the Dominican Republic when a Communist takeover threatened to engulf the nation. NSA said that this military intervention violated the sovereignty of an independent state, but the very same Congress urged the United States to consider collective military action against the anti-Communist sovereign state of South Africa in-order-to end racial, economic, and political (e.g., restrictions on Communists and other subversives) discrimination in that country. Thus, it appears, NSA opposes unilateral military action to prevent the establishment of another Cuba in this hemisphere and to protect the lives of American citizens, but, at the same time, would sanction bilateral military action against a non-Communist state. It is also significant that the delegates to the 1965 NSA Congress adopted a resolution on the war in Vietnam which urged the United States to cease offensive military action in South Vietnam and bombings of the North and asked the Johnson Administration to recognize the National Liberation Front as a belligerent in the war, but, at the same time, the resolution did not comment on the brutality and terrorism employed by the Communists against the free people of South Vietnam, nor did it condemn such aggressive military activity on the part of the Viet Cong and their leaders in North Vietnam.

This is but one example of the consistently left wing attitude of NSA's resolutions. The Association is quick to condemn any apparent injustice in pro-Western countries (e.g., Spain and South Africa), but appears reluctant to do the same in regard to similar or even worse conditions in Communist states even through this injustice may manifest itself in aggressive military action against

³⁶ *Minutes*, Sixth National Student Congress, August, 1953, pg. 100. The final sentence was later amended to read ". . . forwarded to the NSA Staff on the recommendation that this brief be brought to the attention of officials in Washington."

H 1726

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

free nations. We suggest that the interested reader obtain a copy of the NSA's *Codification of Policy* and examine this strange double standard for himself.

NASA'S SERVICES TO MEMBERS' SCHOOLS

One of NASA's principal selling points is its "service" to member schools. The Student Government Information Service (SGIS) is the "clearinghouse" through which the Association distributes information on various programs to individual student governments. However, much of the information which the SGIS has been able to supply in the past to interested student governments was entirely too theoretical to have any practical application. One of the fundamental deficiencies of NSA's program is its failure to provide member institutions with direct and continuing assistance. A college may be fortunate enough to receive a copy of an SGIS booklet which it requested, but that is generally the last time it hears from NSA. Although the Association employs a relatively large staff, its interest in political matters seem to take priority over its interest in matters relevant to the academic community. "In the past," says the October, 1965, issue of *Moderator* (page 29) "USNSA has barely kept up with its basic services".

For schools which are genuinely interested in solutions to student government problems, NSA is definitely not the answer. Such schools can find the assistance which they are seeking in state and regional organizations which have been established for the sole purpose of helping member schools in their campus programming and with a great deal less of a financial strain on the student government's budget. Political activity of the type conducted by NSA is best left to organizations specifically designed for that purpose. This is where campus groups of YAF, the Campus ADA, Young Republicans and Young Democrats should come in. It is through these groups that a student can freely choose the political programs and ideology or philosophy which best represents his views as an individual. For those who argue that students ought to be taking a greater interest in national and international affairs the answer is that NSA is not the proper place for shaping such interest.

The National Student Association claims to speak on behalf of the American student community on subjects which are beyond the constitutional realm of the organization. Moreover, the line that it takes is nearly always representative of the Leftist elite which controls the Association. *There is no real political consensus among American students* and any attempt to speak on behalf of the American student community in matters political should be suspect. It is reasonable to believe that the opinions of students tend to divide just as they do among the general public, according to geography, parental influence, religion, and social views.

Conservative student leaders recognize the need for confederations of student governments: confederations created for, and dedicated to, the promotion of better student government programming on the American college campus. NSA has ignored this purpose and failed in this goal. Other student confederations based on mutual interests already exist i.e., the Associated Student Governments of the United States of America (ASG), the Southern Universities Student Government Association; and other denominational or regional associations.

Where a college or university belongs to NSA, we believe that they should withdraw and align themselves instead with other schools on either a geographical, sectarian or enrollment basis. A realistic association of schools would take cognizance of the differences between them (e.g., size, location) and would attempt to reconcile these differences to the mutual benefit of all concerned.

NSA AND THE FRATERNITY SYSTEM

In keeping with its policy of general antipathy to traditional American values and institutions, NSA has taken a militantly anti-Greek stand. The Association's anti-Greek nature has not, however, escaped the attention of fraternity and sorority leaders throughout the United States, nor does it represent an innovation in NSA policy. Thus, the 1952-53 NSA President Richard J. Murphy was able to tell the delegates to the 1953 NSA Congress that the National Pan-Hellenic Council was one of the principal opponents of NSA. Murphy said: "For six years the Pan-Hellenic Council, i.e., the adult council, has not approved of the Association." He accused the Pan-Hellenic Council of circulating "poison pen letters" against the National Student Association. "This is the type of propaganda to which the Association and its officers have been subjected. Such attacks are insidious. Despite the Association's efforts to clear up the situation, no cooperation has been extended by the Council. I have become convinced that these people do not want to become enlightened."⁴³

Eventually widespread criticism of the Association's anti-Greek policies forced NSA to candidly solicit the support of the Greeks. Typical of this subterfuge was a resolution adopted by the delegates to the 11th National Student Congress which consented to recognize "the contribution made by fraternal organizations to campus leadership" and urged a "closer relationship" between such groups and NSA.⁴⁴ However, NSA defined the type of fraternity it would like to promote on the college campus in its Basic Policy Declaration (BPD) on "Model Educational Practices Standards" under the section dealing with "Restrictive Clauses in Student Social Organizations". The resolution says:

"No incoming group shall be allowed on campus which contains in its constitution and/or by-laws discriminatory clauses with regard to race, color, religion, creed, political belief, or national origin. In the case of existing organizations which do discriminate, the institution and student body should make every reasonable effort to obtain the elimination of such discriminatory practices as rapidly as possible."⁴⁵

In the summer of 1965, a resolution entitled "Discrimination in Membership Selection and Pledge Abuse in Campus Fraternal Organizations" was introduced at the 18th National Student Congress. Once again, the resolution recognized the contributions which the Greeks have made to the American student community, but the "FACT" section also said, "... instances of personal degradation by fraternal organizations across the United States continue to prove harmful to the university atmosphere." The Mandate section of the resolution directed the Association's National Affairs Vice President to conduct surveys of fraternal discrimination, methods utilized to investigate complaints of such practices, and "help given by college and university administrations to chapters of national fraternal organizations which become local organizations". The resolution also directed the NAVP to send copies of the surveys, in the form of a report, to NSA member schools to assist them in establishing "a review date" after which "recognition would be withdrawn from those chapters which are affiliated with national organizations which have discriminatory membership selection".⁴⁶ Fearing the reaction

that such a directive would initiate among the Greeks, the Congress deleted the Mandate and passed the remainder of the resolution, but the resolution's sponsors then called for a reconsideration of the remaining portions of the proposition whereupon it was defeated. However, much of the resolution that was defeated in 1965 was already contained in a program Resolution (PR) which was adopted by the delegates to the 1964 NSA Congress entitled "Discrimination in Membership Selection in Campus Fraternal Organizations". The Mandate of the 1964 resolution made almost exactly the same provisions for "review dates", etc. as the aforementioned resolution and was passed by a substantial margin at the 17th NSA Congress.⁴⁷

FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER FRATERNITIES URGED

At the Eighteenth Congress in 1965 NSA urged the "Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and any other division of the Federal Government involved in the administering and granting of federal funds to write specific regulations implementing nondiscriminatory compliance and coverage under Title VI (Civil Rights Act of 1964) for the following:

1. Off-campus housing approved by any institution of higher learning.
2. Accommodations in houses and dormitories occupied by fraternal organizations.
3. Membership in any fraternal, social, professional, or business organization, club, association, group, committee, which is approved by a college or university."

Prior to and following such regulations by the Office of Education and other appropriate agencies, USNSA urged students to institute research groups into University operations and to serve as "monitors" for infractions of Federal law.

This shocking attempt to interfere into all private groups is strictly forbidden by the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Sec. 804. (a) "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any Department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy) which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution."

WHAT GREEKS SAY ABOUT NSA

For many years fraternity and sorority leaders have patiently abstained from any overt hostility to NSA, hoping that with maturity NSA would return to the mainstream of American student consensus and abandon its anti-Greek policies. However, time has indicated conclusively that NSA is firm in its determination to destroy the American Fraternity System. Greek leaders have finally resolved to speak out; to point out to members of fraternal groups on the campuses the true nature of NSA and to urge them to work to disassociate their campuses from NSA.

"The Stop-NSA Committee is to be wholeheartedly commended for its constructive and aggressive activity in uncovering the insidious Un-American program of the Na-

⁴³ *Minutes*, Sixth National Student Congress, August, 1953, pg. 24.

⁴⁴ *Codification of Policy, 1964-65*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 106.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pg. 42.

⁴⁶ *Policy Calendar*, 18th. National Student Congress, 1965, item 485/1-2.

⁴⁷ *Codification of Policy, 1964-65*, by USNSA, Philadelphia, Pa., pg. 90.

February 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 1727

tional Student Association. The NSA is misrepresenting in a most unwholesome manner the true character and aspirations of the majority of America's young citizenry."—Mrs. C. M. Jansky, Past Grand President, Alpha Gamma Delta Fraternity.

"The use of front organizations purporting to espouse worthy and idealistic objectives is a technique often employed to further the sinister ends of atheistic communism. On the surface, NSA, to the unwary, might appear to be what its name implies, a voluntary association of college students, national in scope, conducted by its members and delegates in truly representative fashion. However, those who have looked behind its facade of respectability have found strange hands directing it under cover of darkness toward collectivist mastery of group action, sometimes to the exact opposite of expressed desires and plans of the collegians themselves. Without right or power, it pretends to represent those whom it degrades. It falsely denies to fraternities the freedom of association it so loudly proclaims for itself. NSA does not and cannot promote the cause of liberty, for actually it is an implement of slavery."—Sherwood Blue, Past National President, Theta Chi Fraternity.

"It is my firm belief that the principles and programs advocated by NSA are inimical to the best interests of the country and to the fraternity system, and should not be supported by fraternities and sororities."—Beatrice H. Wittenberg, NPC Delegate, Gamma Phi Beta.

"Where specific inquiries have been made from the Chapters, we have advised that they oppose membership in NSA by voting against either gaining or continuing membership in this organization."—Roy C. Clark, Executive Secretary, Acacia Fraternity.

"Once I had hopes that true representatives of the Fraternity System might be able to guide NSA into channels that would make it better represent the majority of the substantial number of students it contended it did represent. I urged fraternity men and women to do this but was disappointed. For many years I have not approved many NSA policies and procedures and see no reason now to change my mind."—Francis S. Van Derbur, Chairman, Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council, Past President, Kappa Sigma Fraternity.

"It is my observation that one of the aims of the NSA is to destroy the American fraternity system. I personally have derived great benefit from membership in my fraternity. To my personal knowledge, many, many others have similarly benefited. In token payment for the benefits derived, I shall continue to serve and fight for the American fraternity system against all its enemies, including NSA. I hope that the undergraduate members of my fraternity will join me in our fight for survival."—John E. Scott, President, Board of Trustees, Fraternity of Phi Gamma Delta.

"In very few specific instances, if any, have I found the aims and objectives of the National Student Association to coincide with those of the American College Greek Letter Fraternity system. After observing the NSA for a number of years I have no hope for a realignment of its activities to more closely coincide with the American College Greek Letter Fraternity system. In every instance wherein my opinion is requested I suggest that the NSA be removed from a campus, or in the instance of a vote for initial acceptance of NSA my counsel is for a negative vote."—Durward Owen, Executive Secretary, The Phi Kappa Phi Fraternity.

"I strongly object to not only the National Student Association but any other group or organization interfering with what I call the personal and civil rights of fraternities and sororities which are voluntary membership societies. We don't interfere with the manner which NSA selects or discriminates in connection with its membership, and the

NSA should not interfere with the internal policies of fraternities and sororities."—Harold Jacobsen, Editor, The Emerald Sigma Pi, Sigma Pi Fraternity.

"I have read with interest the latest NSA statement regarding fraternities. It clearly is hostile to the best interests of the system. To subscribe to it would be to deny the basic character of the Greek system: the right voluntarily to choose one's associates. It would be impossible to meet the standard set down by NSA unless we were to allow NSA to choose our members for us. I can only conclude that NSA has abandoned any friendly stance it might once have adopted toward fraternities and has now consciously set out on an open course of opposition to the American Fraternity System. For this reason, I urge all members of my fraternity to oppose attempts to affiliate their school with NSA, and where their school is presently affiliated, to work for its withdrawal."—William S. Zerman, Executive Secretary, Fraternity of Phi Gamma Delta.

"During my 12 years of active national fraternity leadership, I watched closely the activities of NSA, and none of the faults of NSA which I recognized at the outset were corrected during that period.

"One of our young alumnae was among the students who organized NSA. She was amazed to learn recently from authentic reports of its current activities and how far afield it had gone from the purposes and needs which prompted its formation in 1947.

"In my opinion, NSA has by its adoption of policy statements on 'restrictive membership' clauses in student social organizations' disregarded the privacy to which voluntary social associations are entitled by our Federal Constitution. The NSA statements seem to deny freedom of choice in membership selection by social groups on the one hand while professing belief in this freedom on the other. Further, it seems to me that NSA is not as interested in representing the ideas of its student membership as it is in trying to direct and control them.

"In view of the many resolutions passed by NSA which favor the extreme leftists elements of this country and the world, I am convinced that NSA is inimical to the existence of private voluntary groups such as fraternities. The freedom for such groups to exist is denied in Communist, Socialist, or Totalitarian societies. It is for this reason that I felt during my tenure of office that it was important to alert our membership, both collegiate and alumnae, to the nature of NSA. I have not changed my mind since that time.

"It has been very encouraging to learn of the increasing number of students bodies which have rejected affiliation with NSA."—Mrs. Robert W. Preston, Past President, Delta Gamma Fraternity.

"Nothing that I have read or heard about the United States National Student Association has suggested that it is a healthy, qualified, student organization. Rather, NSA appears constantly to agitate for interference in the affairs of other student organizations. This has been particularly true with regard to American fraternities and sororities, whose freedom of membership selection has been constantly under attack by NSA.

"NSA does not represent a majority of the students in the United States. Its wide range of resolutions, covering nearly all the controversial political questions of the day, brand it as a radical organization, clearly unrepresentative of thinking American students. NSA leaders could more profitably spend their time attending to their daily academic studies and leave the world's problems to those more qualified to solve them."—Julia Faqua Ober, Past National President, Kappa Delta.

"We have long regarded NSA as an enemy of fraternities and have consistently advised our collegiate chapters to oppose NSA affiliation."—Richard R. Fletcher, Executive Secretary, Sigma Nu Fraternity.

"Any acceptance of NSA by the American college fraternity will have to be based upon their cessation of attacks upon the fraternity and its right to be selective in choosing its new members. I am positive that if I showed an attitude of 'live and let live' in 1957, I underwent a considerable change after that date due to the repeated adoption of resolutions by the NSA Congress each year attacking or criticizing the American college fraternity."—Judge Frank H. Myers, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, Kappa Alpha Order.

"On the basis of careful consideration of the policies endorsed by the United States National Student Association over a period of years, I have become increasingly convinced that this organization does not represent the thinking of the majority of United States students. Judging by the number of schools whose students have voted to withdraw from or not to affiliate with NSA, it appears that students on many campuses share this view.

"In my opinion, NSA's recent statement regarding fraternities is indicative of an ambition to interfere with the right of voluntary association guaranteed to us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and that in striving to prevent NSA's entrance to a campus or to effect its withdrawal from a campus, fraternity members will be working to preserve not only the Fraternity system, but the whole concept of a free society."—Louise L. Moore, Past National President, Phi Mu Fraternity.

"Where student governments are affiliated with NSA, the college administrations seem unaware that they are arbitrarily billing all students for NSA dues and fees. Activity fees are charged on bills sent to students or to their parents along with tuition charges, etc. A portion of the activity fee goes to the student council and thence as dues to NSA. Administrations do not realize they are forcing students to pay union dues. (NSA describes itself as a union of students). It seems to me that those students who do not wish to be represented in or by NSA could request a refund from the college for amounts involuntarily paid for NSA."—Mrs. George G. Rudolph, NPC Delegate, Delta Delta Delta.

"The more we learn of NSA, the more we realize that it does not really represent the students of America, and that it is strongly influenced by people and organizations whose ideals run contrary to the American free enterprise system. I know of no national fraternity or sorority leaders who support NSA today."—Haldon C. Dick, Assistant Executive Secretary, Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity.

"It has been my observation and experience that NSA does not serve the best interests of fraternities and sororities, nor does it adequately or effectively represent the student body. I would urge strongly that you vote against affiliation with the NSA."—Stewart D. Daniels, Alpha Tau Omega Foundation.

"We believe the principles and programs advocated by NSA are inimical to the best interests of the country and to the fraternity system, and have urged our chapter members to vote against this referendum."—Beatrice Wittenberg, National Panhellenic Delegate, Gamma Phi Beta.

"I personally cannot see how it would be to the advantage of the great student body of the University of Texas to be affiliated with NSA. The cost is ridiculous and the individual student would receive no advantage from the affiliation. In the past, NSA has concerned itself with fraternity membership selection and other matters with which it has no authority to deal. A careful investigation of the operations of NSA in the past several years will show that many prominent campuses throughout the country have consistently declined to affiliate with it."—William Forester, Executive Secretary, Kappa Alpha.

"As a national fraternity we would like to ask that you encourage our members not to

H 1728

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

February 23, 1967

vote in favor of the referendum. We have found through past experience that the National Student Association does not function for the benefit of college students. All activities engaged in by the Association are and have been in the past for the benefit of certain select individuals. The American college student is merely being used as a front."—Elmer Blumenkamp, Executive Secretary, Theta Xi.

"The organization is controlled by a select group and is not representative of the membership in the organization, and the controlling group is more politically minded than is proper. The group which issues statements in behalf of the organization is self-perpetuating to a large degree and does not reflect the attitude and opinion of the general membership. There is, of course, question as to the democratic nature of the organization. I know that many schools have withdrawn from the organization recently for the above reasons. My recommendation to you would be to oppose the affiliation."—Jack L. Anson, National Secretary, Phi Kappa Tau.

"Most fraternity and sorority leaders oppose affiliation and with good reason. I think the motives of the organization and the quality and direction of its leadership is extremely suspect. I would urge you to give more careful consideration to this question. NSA has proved to be a most disruptive influence with very little to recommend it."—Mrs. Russell Strickland, National Panhellenic Delegate, Delta Gamma.

"We have been unable to learn of any benefit that would accrue to the members of fraternal organizations by virtue of the affiliation of the student body with NSA."—Harold Buchanan, Executive Secretary, Delta Chi.

"This organization is divisive and does not truly work for the best interests of the students in many cases. There is a new organization called the Associated Student Governments of the United States, and if they live up to their stated principles, I think this will have much more value to the student body than does NSA."—Bruce Melchert, Executive Secretary, Tau Kappa Epsilon.

"Alpha Phi believes that the National Student Association as presently constituted is antidemocratic in character and is unrepresentative of the majority of the students in the United States. We are opposed to this organization in its present form."—LaVerne Harvey, Executive Secretary, Alpha Phi.

YOU MUST DECIDE

The solution of the NSA question is up to you. The National Student Association has a number of paid staff people who work full time attempting to convince the American student community and the general public that NSA is, in fact, the legitimate representative of the American student. Thousands of students have recognized this deceit and have worked diligently on their individual campuses to obtain a decision to leave the ranks of NSA. The list of schools which have either ousted NSA or which have rejected membership in the Association has grown tremendously since 1961. Today, NSA "represents" less than fifteen per cent (15%) of the colleges, universities, and junior colleges in the United States which are, according to the NSA Constitution, eligible for membership in the Association. If your college or university is presently affiliated with NSA or if your school is presently considering affiliation with NSA, then it is up to you to act and expose NSA for what it really is—a fantastic fraud.

NASSER THREATENS THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from New York [Mr. FARBSTAIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker it is reported in the morning press that President Nasser has once again resorted to his habit of blackmail against the United States to keep his hands free for troublemaking in the Middle East.

The Egyptian President, according to this report, has said he contemplates defaulting on his debts to the United States. These debts, let me remind you, have been incurred not because this country is engaged in any profitmaking endeavors in Egypt but because we answered Nasser's pleas to help feed his starving countrymen. To some extent, the Egyptian people are starving because President Nasser diverts his agricultural resources to buy arms from the Communist bloc. Now he has the audacity to say he will not pay us what he owes us, though his is a solemn obligation incurred by one sovereign state to another. I wonder if President Nasser understands the obligation of sovereignty.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to use aid as a lever to influence a country's domestic practices. Of this, we must be very careful; but it is another to use aid to influence a country's foreign policies in the direction of peace. That is a legitimate, in fact an essential, characteristic of our aid programs, in my mind. But that is precisely what President Nasser is complaining about.

I would not give Nasser another grain of wheat if he pursues the practice of disturbing Middle Eastern tranquility. It is my view that we should tell him, in the face of the blackmail threat, to find some other way to feed his people. It is he, after all, not the United States, who is responsible to them in the first instance. I suggest we give President Nasser no further assistance until he learns we will not submit to his threats, his insults, his blackmail, until he learns to grow up and behave like a responsible leader.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of CIA links to the National Student Association, to the American Newspaper Guild, to American business foundations, has caused an uproar in high Government circles and in the little precinct.

The President has called for an investigation, the Vice President is appalled, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is deeply concerned—and understandably enough—the president of the National Student Association, according to a Washington newspaper, "has gotten sick to his stomach."

This whole sad story is tragic indeed, especially to the reputation and worth of the Nation's largest student organization. But in an area where the right hand is never supposed to know what the left hand is doing, it is completely ludicrous to discover that the left hand did not even know what the left hand had been doing.

The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the executive branch, sitting on the National Security Council in an advisory role to the President. Yet he did not know of these connections which have existed since the early 1950's.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities must be chagrined that left-leaning students and labor leaders who have so aroused its ire are representatives of organizations financed and perhaps guided by a Government agency it previously considered an unimpeachable ally. It would be an amusing spectacle to see the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Central Intelligence Agency investigate each other. The CIA could use as a motive that everything in the universe belongs properly in its balliwick; HUAC might forthrightly insist upon its mission to expose all truly un-American influence, covert and obvious, on the American way of life.

Last summer Members of the U.S. Senate solemnly refused to increase the membership of the CIA Oversight Committee. In the words of one Senator:

The primary objective has always been to avoid leaks.

Declared another Senator in the same debate:

Senators are not always good security risks. It seems to me that anybody who is involved on a Committee of this sort should be picked by those who are best at keeping secrets after they have had several years to observe him as one of those who keeps secrets best.

Well, they kept the secret all right. If the CIA would not tell the President, then the Oversight Committee in not informing him, itself, completely lived up to its name by committing the biggest oversight possible.

In intelligence operations I am informed that overclassification—that is, classifying information "top secret" when it should be treated merely as confidential, for instance—is considered a great bottleneck both to security and efficient operations. Not informing the President of the United States as to the full extent that the CIA's tentacles had wound their way into America's private life has to be one of the biggest overclassification blunders in which the Agency has ever partaken. Lord grant that there are no others.

In a month when the birthdays of Lincoln and Washington give occasion to prideful speeches about our Republic and the liberty and freedom that it has fostered, it is ironic that simultaneously another creation of this same Republic should be the object of indignant headlines which augur up the haunting image of "Big Brother."

What is this organization that deems it necessary to make secret connection with the educational, labor, and business communities of the United States? What is this CIA that it should be the arbiter of what is right and just?

The chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has announced his intention for an inquiry into the CIA's links past and present with U.S. universities. I support him in this endeavor. Perhaps indeed it will be found that a law is needed requiring the registration of Government agencies trying to influence education just as we have laws